

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The following remarks are responsive to the October 23, 2006 Final Office Action. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,149 issued to Jammes, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,416 issued to Gregg, et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,480 issued to Donohue, et al. The rejection asserts that Jammes and Gregg allegedly teach each element of the claims except for reformatting of requested information based on the information regarding the user's remote access device, which is allegedly taught by Donohue.

The claims as previously amended are directed toward remotely accessing subscriber information from an enterprise network in real-time in which a rendering module interacts with a screen bank containing screen data, wherein the rendering module uses the screen data to reformat said data for said remote access device based on said device specific information. The screen bank is shown in Figure 5, item 506 and described in the specification in paragraphs 0074 and 0075. As described in the specification, the screen bank contains screen data including templates (paragraph 0075) which the rendering module can then use to format the data. The screen bank allows formatting of device specific information in a simple and quick manner.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests the use of a screen bank with screen data or templates based on device specific information. Jammes and Gregg only discuss modifying the information into browser specific formats using information such as type of browser or operating

system. Donohue teaches using templates to account for browser specific information. In the rejection, the Examiner states that the amended claims have been interpreted to read “wherein said rendering module communicates with said navigation module using *browser* specific information provided by the rendering module modifies the response data for said remote access device in accordance with said *browser* specific information using the screen data. Applicants agree that under that interpretation, Donohue would provide the teaching necessary to obviate the claims. However, this is not how the claims read, nor is it how they should be interpreted. Each independent claim is specific in that it claims the formatting is based on device specific information. Device information and browser information are not equivalent. For example, a plurality of different devices, each with differing capabilities, may all run the same browser. If the claims were interpreted using browser specific information, the data will not be modified in the most efficient format for each device. One device running browser A may be fully capable of running video clips, while a second device running the same browser A is unable to run the video clips. Without using device specific information, the server would not know whether to send a video clip as part of the screen data if only browser specific information is used. Donohue never teaches or suggests looking to the capabilities of the device to determine and format the screen data. Only the present claims take into account the plurality of devices all having differing capabilities. When the claims are read as written, and not inappropriately broadened, the cited art does not teach or suggest the limitations of the claims.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 10, and 17 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 10, and 17 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1, 10, and 17.

Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-21 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 1, 10, and 17, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-21 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-21.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated December 18, 2006

By: /James T. Hagler/
James T. Hagler
Reg. No. 40,631
(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502